

S 4054

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 24, 1983

ask them first to get out of Cyprus. Ask them to withdraw the troops in the Greek frontiers and their landing crafts in the Aegean Sea. Surely this does not serve the NATO mission.

Turkey has never been an ally to America. It we Greece who fought the Nazi Germans and the bayonets of Mussolini. If we keep giving military aid to Turkey, we will create enemies of the Turkish people. Does the present Administration, the Pentagon and State Department realize that this will come back to haunt us when the lid is lifted and a rebellious, religious uprising takes place?

Does our present Administration realize that the arms American taxpayer money is giving to the Turks may be turned against Israel and Jerusalem in a religious war?

Let our money be spent in America to create jobs, to feed the hungry and fill our children's lunchboxes, to protect our elderly, to strengthen our Social Security, to build up our defenses and to decrease our deficits. Our priorities should be America first and definitely not the junta government of Turkey.

We celebrate independence today and our obligation and responsibility is not to lose it. America carries the "torch of democracy" and we believe in America and know it is in good hands. Don't shatter our beliefs in America. Don't let the Greeks down. We look to America to protect our freedom and remind our American brethren of the words put down in the Greek National Anthem:

FREEDOM

I recognize you from the fearful sight of the sword. I recognize you from the edge when it cuts deep down the earth.

I salute Freedom which as in the past rises valiant from the holy bones of the Greeks.

Freedom, I rejoice and salute you.

America: It is the Greeks who are and always will be your ally!

SAFEGUARDING NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, the recent Presidential directive on safeguarding national security information has aroused proper concern. It carries the risk of severe abuses. Indeed, this directive and last year's Executive order on national security information could undermine public acceptance of the whole system for protecting national secrets.

The problem of leaks is a real one. Disclosures of classified information have caused real damage to the national security, and there is a clear need to remind people of the obligation to keep these secrets. But our sense of obligation must rest on more than lie detector tests, censorship, or crackdowns on contacts with the press.

How can we maintain that sense of obligation? First—and most importantly—there must be public confidence that the secrets are worth keeping. Second, those with access to secret information must be confident that decisionmakers are being presented all the relevant information. Until these twin foundations are made more secure, the edifice of secrecy will continue to be undermined by both public and bureaucratic cynicism.

Last year's Executive order reduced public confidence that our secrets

were worth keeping. The idea that classified information must be information the unauthorized disclosure of which would cause "identifiable" damage to the national security was swept away. So was the idea that those who classify information should weigh the need for secrecy against "the public interest in disclosure." These approaches had been particularly useful because they required a more thoughtful approach to classification decisions. Last year's order replaced thoughtfulness with mechanical routine. This can only lead more people to question whether national secrets truly deserve protection.

It was because of this concern that I introduced the Freedom of Information Protection Act, which I will soon reintroduce for consideration by the 98th Congress. Congress cannot take over the classification system. But we can protect the Freedom of Information Act, which is a crucial safeguard for the public. And by maintaining a standard of thoughtfulness at least in FOIA decisions, we can help maintain public acceptance of secrecy for the information that is not released.

The new Presidential directive seems to substitute force for obligation. This may be necessary in a cynical age, but each provision can easily be abused. Lie detectors can be used to harass low-level employees, even though the big leakers are almost invariably senior officials. Prepublication review can be used to delay or present publication of embarrassing information, rather than real secrets. And limitations on press contacts may serve merely to insure that the only leaks are those that favor existing policy.

Moreover, the new Presidential directive is impractical, for it fails to shore up those twin foundations of confidence on which the protection of national secrets rests. It comes from an executive branch whose most searching leak investigation dealt with embarrassing budget figures, rather than vital secrets. It is undermined whenever a CIA Director tells the press about his classified budget or his covert action operations. It will not stem the tide of cynicism while the Defense Department selectively declassified sensitive information whenever it wants a larger defense budget.

Presidential directives are all well and good, but an end to mixed signals would do more to protect our secrets than will a hundred prepublication reviews of memoirs or novels. Some strong administrative action against the next senior official who leaks classified information that supports administration policy would do more than a thousand lie detectors. I am sure that there will be opportunities for such leadership; I will be looking to the President to provide it.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial "Domestic Spying and Free Speech," from the Minneapolis Star and Tribune be included in today's Record.

The editorial follows:

DOMESTIC SPYING AND FREE SPEECH

Sometimes the government must spy on a citizen to protect the public interest. That is why the FBI must have freedom to investigate suspected criminals. But citizens who aren't suspected of breaking the law should not have to endure governmental intrusion. That is where the Justice Department's new guidelines for FBI domestic spying fall short.

The new guidelines, which took effect yesterday, mark the first comprehensive revision of the spying rules since Gerald Ford's attorney general, Edward Levi, cracked down on FBI investigations of domestic "subversion" in 1976. Surveillance of unpopular political groups, the Levi guidelines said, can be justified only when reason exists to believe a crime has been or will be committed. Levi's rules required agents to consider citizens' rights to privacy and free expression before conducting a full investigation.

The new guidelines are a step backward. Among other things, they allow the FBI to infiltrate organizations for a "preliminary investigation" before the FBI has a "reasonable indication of criminal activities." They permit the monitoring of organizations that have a suspicious history but are currently inactive. And they encourage the FBI to investigate groups or persons who publicly advocate "criminal activity" to achieve "political and social change."

Perhaps the guidelines could be used for good ends. But they could also be used to persecute citizens who have done nothing wrong. Critics raise some interesting questions: Could the guidelines be used to justify spying on members of a political party that advocates revolution in the far future? What about an individual who exhorts young people to resist the draft? Or a human-rights leader who urges civil disobedience to promote social change? Could the new rules leave these citizens vulnerable to FBI investigation?

That kind of radical-chasing seems at least possible. The guidelines allow full-fledged spying on the basis of advocacy alone. But American citizens have always been free to speak out without fear of inviting government surveillance. The new FBI rules will unnecessarily chill dissent and endanger that freedom. Congress should write rules for the FBI that protect citizens' right to speak—and pass the rules into law.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, Friday, March 25, marks the 162d anniversary of the Greek War of Independence from Turkey in 1821. We of Greek-American heritage can be especially proud of our ancestry. Democracy, freedom, and justice have their beginnings in ancient Greek civilization.

Greeks have traditionally been a proud and industrious people, bound by common beliefs in a strong family unit, education, and respect for individual rights. These values have been handed down from generation to generation and are firmly implanted in the Greek-American families and communities in the United States. Contributions of the sons and daughters of immigrant tailors, restaurant workers, and small businessmen such as my grandfather, who operated a dry-cleaning store in Lowell, Mass., have been felt in every area of American

March 24, 1983

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 4053

ades with little of the scrutiny from Congress that the service requests get. Uniformed services have been jousting with the civilians over authority and responsibility. Micromanagement spills on down the line as the services in turn peer over industry's shoulder, in self defense from the watchers in the Defense Dept. and Congress. At worst, there can be more workers checking than building.

Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has tried to put some ground rules into effect, such as ordering memos from his defense under secretaries to route through him for approval before they are transmitted to the services to become orders or program additions.

The defense under secretaries or the services are not the villains as much as the system. Spinney, though his name raises blood pressures drastically in the services, is right about cost growth of procurement programs. There is just nothing much new about that. It has been true of programs for decades—as in the case of the proliferation of research and development programs in the Eisenhower presidency that led to abrupt cancellations, which figured in the 1957 recession. It is up to the Defense Dept. to do something about the problem, something the Administration recognizes, rather than accept escalation as inevitable.

The battle over centralization in defense far from settled, but is an important issue. Highly centralized and overstaffed organizations are suspect in both the corporate and government realms, and the warriors battling for return of more authority and responsibility for the commander who has the combat responsibility have a tough war to win. This Administration has at least paid more attention to the problem and given them more encouragement than most others in the last 20 or 30 years. Cost control and budget control start with fixing responsibility in the right place.

RETHINKING DEFENSE AND CONVENTIONAL FORCES

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, on March 18 I read an article published by UPI which quoted my friend and colleague, JOHN GLENN, regarding his views on the B-1 bomber and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I found this article to be of great interest, and I think that my colleagues will agree.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of this article appear at this point in the Record.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—Sen. John Glenn, of Ohio, a Democratic Presidential candidate, Friday said the country needs the B-1 bomber and the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be replaced with a central military staff.

Glenn made the recommendations in a study, "Rethinking Defense and Conventional Forces," for the Center for National Policy, an independent policy institute chaired by former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

"We need the B-1 bomber, because the aging B-52's will not last forever and the 'Stealth' is too far in the future and technically too uncertain to depend upon today," Glenn said.

In calling for replacement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Glenn said, "Our central military staff organization was designed during World War II, and it is no more suited to current needs than would be the weapons of that era.

"It is time to follow the lead of the British and most other modern powers, and estab-

lish a central military staff that is not controlled by the bureaucracies of the four military services—one that can recommend hard program choices, and that can give useful military advice to the civilian leadership," Glenn said. "The present system is overdue for modernization."

Glenn also called for a new class of smaller submarines. "We can afford these things without undue sacrifices," Glenn said.

In the same study, Robert Komer, former national security council official and former Deputy Secretary of Defense, said canceling systems like the B-1, two more carrier battle groups, and the Maverick and Viper missiles could pare \$100 billion from the cost of Reagan's five-year, \$1.7 trillion military plan.

Komer said the "service-dominated" Joint Chiefs of Staff "is structurally incapable of . . . advising on spending priorities if service oxen would be goaded."

"Hence, JCS reform is crucial to sound conventional force decisions. Civilians in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council and Congress need—and are entitled to—more and better military advice than the current system permits."

Barry Carter, former senior counsel to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence activities and former member of the National Security Council staff, did not address the B-1 issue directly, but did call for strengthening conventional forces "often ignored in the intense public discussion of large, expensive nuclear weapons systems like the B-1 bomber and the MX missile." ●

NATIONAL DAY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the 162d anniversary of Greek independence from the Turkish Ottoman Empire.

On this occasion, we are reminded again of the deep and abiding commitment of the Greek nation to freedom, to justice, and to democracy. We are reminded of the strong and continuing ties between Greece and the United States—and of the major contribution Greece has made to America through generations of Greek Americans and through its great civilization and political and economic traditions.

But we are also reminded of the continuing tragedy in Cyprus, and of the need for a lasting political settlement based on the legitimate rights of both the Greek majority and the Turkish minority. We are reminded of the wise precedent set by the Congress in maintaining a ratio of 7 to 10 in aid appropriated for Greece and Turkey, a ratio which would be broken by the administration's most recent proposals for military aid to Turkey. In presenting its request, the Reagan administration is asking the Congress to tilt unfairly against Greek democracy and toward the rightwing military dictatorship in Turkey, and to become a partner in the unjust Turkish occupation of the island of Cyprus.

Apparently, the administration's concern over the fate of U.S. military bases outweighs its support for democracy and human rights in the eastern Mediterranean. The cornerstone of postwar U.S. foreign policy—the Truman doctrine—was based on a deep

commitment to democracy in Europe, and most notably in Greece. To reduce our affinity for that country, the cradle of democracy, in order to bolster the entrenched military government in Turkey, is contrary to sound and long-accepted American foreign policy.

The United States must continue to be steadfast in our commitment to democracy, political liberty, and economic progress and social justice throughout the world. Greece should be commended for the standards it upholds in these areas and, on this occasion of Greek national day, we should recall the vital ties between our two nations and reiterate our strong support for the vital and close working relationship between the United States and our Greek allies.

Mr. President, George P. Livanos will make tomorrow an eloquent statement on United States-Greek relations and our Nation's policy in the Eastern Mediterranean. Mr. Livanos is an outstanding leader of the Greek-American community and a close and trusted adviser to me and many other Members of Congress. We join in congratulating him for his selection as grand marshal of the Greek Independence Day Parade in New York, and I request that the full text of his remarks appear at this point in the Record.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE P. LIVANOS, GRAND MARSHALL, GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY PARADE
On March 25th we celebrate Greek Independence Day.

In 1821, the Greeks sacrificed their lives to free themselves from 450 years of enslavement by the Turks. We Greek-Americans can never forget this struggle and we must remind ourselves of our inheritance from the classical Greeks who gave the "torch of democracy" to the Western world.

America now carries the "torch of democracy" and is supported by its Declaration of Independence and Constitution to protect it for all humankind.

Today as we parade on Fifth Avenue celebrating our independence, we must reaffirm our resolve to stand by America and the principles for which we both aspire. We must remind ourselves of the moral responsibility of the values we learned from our forefathers to preserve and protect liberty and democracy.

We Greek-Americans knowing from history the tyranny and oppression suffered under Turkish rule, cannot stand idly by letting the present Administration continue their policy of military and economic aid to Turkey. We feel it is wrong to support a military junta government in Turkey which suppresses the freedom of the Turkish people, its political and religious leaders, suppressing it in a cruel and brutal way.

We must remember that for the last 10 years the beautiful island of Cyprus has been occupied by Turkish forces and that the Turkish Cypriots are looking to America to help gain their freedom. The impoverished Turkish Cypriots need help as well as the 200,000 Greek Cypriots who have been kicked out of their homes and are praying and looking forward to going back to their own villages.

If we want to improve and strengthen the Turkish Army for the NATO mission, let us